

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed March 18, 2008. With this Response, claim 15 has been amended and claims 26 and 27 were added. Claims 10-27 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-14 and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman (US 6,737,750), Ma (US 6,271,469) and Yang (US 6,730,544). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 10 includes

wherein the first semiconductor chip is surrounded by the contact pillars and is arranged underneath the chip island such that pillar contact pads of the contact pillars, first face areas of a plastic encapsulation compound that embeds the semiconductor chips, the contact pillars and the flat conductor structure, and the active first face of the first semiconductor chip, form an overall first face,
wherein a wiring layer is arranged on the overall first face and electrically connects the semiconductor chips to one another via wiring lines....

Claim 19 includes similar limitations regarding the overall first face structure.

The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not necessarily render the resultant combination obvious. See, MPEP 2143.01. The Office Action cites Ma as teaching the formation of encapsulation material of the dies that is planar with the active surface of the die in order to increase surface area for trace formation, citing column 4, lines 1 to 5 of Ma. However, Ma teaches this advantage as an advantage over a true chip size package in which only the area of the chip itself is available for traces and outer contacts such as solder balls. This advantage would not be realized if the arrangement taught by Ma were combined with the package of Hoffman since Hoffman already teaches a substrate with an area larger than the semiconductor chip.

Amendment and Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Edward Fuergut et al.

Serial No.: 10/529,565

Filed: October 31, 2006

Docket No.: I431.126.101/FIN481PCT/US

Title: ELECTRONIC COMPONENT AND A PANEL

Therefore, there would be no reason for one having ordinary skill in the art to include the arrangement of Ma in the package of Hoffman, since there would be no technical advantage provided by such a combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit the Office Action fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness and claims 10 and 19, as well as the claims dependent thereon, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hoffman (US 6,737,750) and Ma (US 6,271,469). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 15 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed method. For example, claim 15 as amended includes “the flat conductors extend between neighboring chip islands...” The Office Action equates the substrate 10 shown in Figure 6A of Hoffman with the leadframe recited in claim 15. The Office Action refers to items 14i and 14k shown in Figure 6A of Hoffman with regards to the chip island and flat conductors recited in claim 15. The Office Action does not identify a disclosure of the “flat conductors” 14k shown in Figure 6A of Hoffman as extending between neighboring chip islands. Figure 6A of Hoffman clearly shows item 14k completely within the plastic encapsulation 19 and thus appears to teach away from an arrangement where these conductors extend between neighboring chip islands.

Therefore, claims 15-18 are all believed to be allowable over the combination of Hoffman and Ma.

New Claims

New claims 26 and 27 have been added herein. No new matter has been introduced. The added claims ultimately depend from claim 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Further, claims 26 and 27 recite further details of the wiring layer that do not appear to be disclosed or suggested in the Hoffman or Ma references.

Amendment and Response Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Applicant: Edward Fuergut et al.

Serial No.: 10/529,565

Filed: October 31, 2006

Docket No.: I431.126.101/FIN481PCT/US

Title: ELECTRONIC COMPONENT AND A PANEL

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0471.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Mark L. Gleason at Telephone No. (612) 767-2503, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Dicke, Billig & Czaja
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Fuergut et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2000
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 06/16/2008

MLG:cjs

/Mark L. Gleason/

Mark L. Gleason

Reg. No. 39,998